



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/635,955	08/07/2003	Peter DeLuca	1332-2	1212
Peter DeLuca 7590 05/22/2009				
Carter, DeLuca, Farrell & Schmidt, LLP				
Suite 225				
445 Broad Hollow Road				
Melville, NY 11747				
EXAMINER				
DESIR, PIERRE LOUIS				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2617				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/22/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/635,955

Applicant(s)

DELUCA ET AL.

Examiner

PIERRE-LOUIS DESIR

Art Unit

2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 March 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 13-26 and 28-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 13-26 and 28-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 15, 17, and 23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sagar, US 6873841 in view of Brown, US 20020156895 A1.

Regarding claim 1, Sagar discloses a cellular telephone (i.e., a PDA 102 comprising a modem which uses CDPD that is supported by cellular service providers or mobile phone 104) (see fig. 1) comprising a memory storing a telephone directory (i.e., database 108 of the PDA or second database, i.e., memory 124, of the mobile phone) (see fig. 1, col. 1, line 62- col. 2, line 4); a processor having access to the telephone directory stored in the memory (as known in the art, a processor is an integral part of a mobile phone or PDA with access to the memory of the device); and a set of instructions capable of being executed by the processor for establishing a communication link with a remote central station storing a plurality of telephone directories (i.e., connection to a predetermined Internet site of server 106) (see fig. 1, col. 5, lines 2-6).

As can be seen above, Sagar discloses that both the PDA and the mobile phone can be connected to server 106. The PDA connects to server 106 to upload copy of database file 108 into storage server (see col. 5, lines 6-10). And, the mobile phone connects to the server to download from the server, e.g., via the Internet, manipulated copy of database file 108 for storage in a second database, i.e., memory, of the mobile phone) (see col. 1, line 66-col. 2, line 2).

Sagar does disclose a device (i.e., mobile phone and PDA) comprising receiving the telephone directory and storing the received telephone directory in the memory of the cellular phone (see col. 1, line 66-col. 2, line 2), and wherein the user is validated, using an identifier or password (i.e., transmission of a unique identification code to the remote central station) (see col. 5, lines 50-52).

Sagar, however, does not specifically disclose a cellular phone wherein the remote central station storing a plurality of telephone directories each assigned a unique identification code and assigned to the transmitted unique identification code to the received telephone directory, wherein said telephone directory including a listing created and transmitted to the remote central station using a computing device not corresponding to a subscriber of the cellular telephone.

However, Brown discloses a method and system for sharing contact information. The method and system comprising storing a user's contact information in a database accessible over a network, receiving identification of a person that the user wishes to authorize for access the user's contact information, enabling the person to access the user's contact information, and transmitting the user's contact information to a computing device of the authorized person from

the database via the network in response to a request for this information (see abstract, paragraphs 8-9, 33-36, and 42-43).

Thus, the combination of Sagar with Brown would yield to a system and method wherein a first device uploads a telephone directory to a server. This telephone directory can be shared by other users or subscribers that different from the user that uploaded the telephone directory. Those authorized users use identifiers or password to obtain the shared directory.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings as described by Sagar with the teachings described by Brown to arrive at the claimed invention. A motivation for doing so would have been to properly and securely share the telephone directory with authorized users.

Regarding claim 2, Sagar discloses a cellular telephone as described above (see claim 1 rejection).

Although Sagar discloses a telephone as described, Sagar does not specifically disclose a telephone wherein the remote central station identifies the telephone directory stored within the memory of the remote central station using the transmitted unique identification.

However, Brown discloses a method, system, and cellular telephone wherein once the application is initiated, the user is prompted for some form of user identification (e.g., through a log in process) to convey the user's authorization, as indicated in block 600. Entry of such information facilitates access to the contacts information of the persons identified in the user's virtual address book. Once the identification is provided, it is received by the contacts information module 214, 314, as indicated in block 602, and the module determines whether the identification is correct, as indicated in decision element 604. If the identification is correct (i.e.,

the user is authenticated), flow continues to block 606 at which the contacts information module 214, 314 receives the user's request to view the virtual address book, as indicated in block 606. More particularly, the module 214, 314 can receive a request to view a particular folder of the address book (see fig. 6, paragraphs 39-40).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings as described by Sagar with the teachings described by Brown to arrive at the claimed invention. A motivation for doing so would have been to properly and securely share the telephone directory with authorized users.

Regarding claim 3, Sagar discloses a cellular telephone (see claim 1 direction) wherein the received directory was created by and transferred to the remote central station using a computing device other than the cellular telephone (i.e., the PDA created and transferred the telephone directory to the server and the mobile phone requests and receives the telephone directory from the server) (see fig. 1, col. 1, line 62- col. 2, line 4).

Regarding claim 4, Sagar a cellular telephone (see claim 1 rejection) further comprising a display and a keypad for selecting at least a portion of the displayed telephone directory desired to be transmitted from the remote central station to the cellular telephone, wherein the received telephone directory only includes the selected portion of the displayed telephone directory (i.e., to allow the user of the database to select which columns need to be transferred to mobile phone 104, the following is recommended. Subsequent to the transfer of database 108 to server 106, application 122 checks to see if this database has been uploaded in the past. For a database that has not been uploaded before, the user is provided with a list of each field (shown on a display of PDA 102), by label and prompted to indicate which fields need to be transferred. A separate

checkbox, one for each database field, is presented on-screen and the user checks appropriate boxes to indicate the fields that need to be transferred to mobile phone 104. On submission of the information by the user to server application 122, the latter stores the user's selection in a way that allows it to be recalled for the specific database 108, when database 108 is uploaded to server 106 again, some time later) (see col. 6, lines 32-50).

Regarding claim 5, Sagar discloses a telephone (see claim 1 rejection) wherein the step of storing the received directory includes overwriting at least a portion of the telephone directory stored within the memory of the cellular telephone with the received telephone directory (i.e., updating information in memory 124) (see col. 6, lines 51-54).

Regarding claim 6, Sager in combination with Brown discloses a cellular telephone (see claim 2 rejection) wherein the step of transmitting the unique identification code to the remote central station occurs on a periodic basis (i.e., whenever a request for information is received) (see Brown's paragraphs 39-40).

Regarding claim 7, the combination of Sager and Brown discloses a telephone wherein the processor executes the set of instructions for instructing the remote central station to broadcast the telephone directory to a plurality of cellular telephones (i.e., means for receiving an identification of persons that a user authorizes to access the user's contact information, and means for transmitting the user's contact information to a computing device) (see Brown's paragraph 9).

Regarding claim 8, Sagar discloses a telephone as described above (see claim 1 rejection) wherein the processor executes the set of instructions for receiving a message transmitted from the remote central station indicating that the telephone directory is available for transmission

from the remote central station to the cellular telephone for storage within the memory of the cellular telephone (see col. 4, lines 20-26); and comprising transmitting a signal to the remote central station, said signal including at least an identification code identifying the telephone directory available for transmission (see col. 5, lines 43-52).

Regarding claim 9, Sagar discloses a telephone (see claim 1 rejection) wherein the processor executes the set of instructions for instructing the remote central station to transmit the telephone directory to a computing device via at least one network (i.e., telephone directory request would instruct the server to transfer the telephone directory to the computing device) (see col. 2, lines 29-31).

4. Claims 10-11, 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sagar and Brown, further in view of Comp.

Regarding claim 10, Sagar discloses a cellular telephone wherein the processor executes the set of instructions for transferring the telephone directory stored in the memory of the cellular telephone to the remote central station and instructing the remote central station to store the transferred telephone directory within a memory (see col. 5, lines 6-10, 43-52).

However, the combination does not specifically disclose a telephone wherein the data that is transferred to the remote central station is stored for a particular time period.

However, Comp discloses a cellular telephone wherein updated directory information is transferred to a remote database periodically (paragraph 32).

Thus, one skilled in the art would find it obvious that information stored on the remote is stored for a particular time interval until new updated information is received.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings as described by Comp with the teachings described by the combination to arrive at the claimed invention. A motivation for doing so would have been to provide or share up-to-date information to other authorized users.

Regarding claim 11, Sager discloses a cellular telephone (see claim 10 rejection) wherein the processor executes the set of instructions for automatically instructing the remote central station to transmit the stored telephone directory or a portion thereof to the cellular telephone after lapse of the particular time period (i.e., periodically transmits the telephone directory) (see col. 1, lines 39-42).

Regarding claim 13, the combination of Sagar and Brown discloses a cellular telephone as described (see claim 1 rejection).

The combination, however, does not specifically disclose a telephone wherein the processor executes the set of instructions for transmitting information corresponding to the subscriber to the remote central station during a registration process, wherein the registration process includes registering the subscriber with the remote central station.

Comp discloses a cellular telephone wherein the processor executes the set of instructions for transmitting information corresponding to the subscriber to the remote central station during a registration process (in a cellular communication system, a vendor will usually program a new cellular telephone for a purchaser to, among other things, associate an identification number of the telephone with a telephone number assigned to the user. This process will typically require communication with a remote network server) (see Comp: paragraph 25), wherein the

registration process includes the step of registering the subscriber with the remote central station (see Comp: fig. 3, page 4, paragraph 25).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings as described by Comp with the teachings described by the combination to arrive at the claimed invention. A motivation for doing so would have been to provide or share up-to-date information to other authorized users.

Regarding claim 14, the combination of Sagar and Brown discloses a telephone as described above (see claim 1 rejection).

The combination, however, does not specifically disclose a telephone wherein the processor executes the set of instructions for performing the steps of: identifying a calling party's telephone number and an entity the telephone number is assigned to, i.e., Caller ID information; and transmitting the Caller ID information to the remote central station for creating a telephone directory listing using the caller ID information and storing the telephone directory listing within the memory of the remote central station.

However, Comp discloses a telephone wherein the processor executes the set of instructions for performing the steps of: identifying a calling party's telephone number and an entity the telephone number is assigned to, i.e., Caller ID information (i.e., the call log database may include call-related information for a predetermined number of previous calls that were placed from and/or received through the user device. The call log database will typically include the phone numbers of the other parties involved in the corresponding calls. Party names and/or other information (e.g., length of call, etc.) may also be stored. The controller may control the maintenance of the call log database or a separate control unit can be provided) (see Comp:

paragraph 12); and transmitting the Caller ID information to the remote central station for creating a telephone directory listing using the caller ID information and storing the telephone directory listing within the memory of the remote central station (see Comp: fig. 2, abstract, and page 2, paragraph 12).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings as described by Comp with the teachings described by the combination to arrive at the claimed invention. A motivation for doing so would have been to provide or share up-to-date information to other authorized users.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Pappalardo et al. (Pappalardo), US 20030148753 A1.

Regarding claim 15, Pappalardo discloses a cellular telephone comprising a memory (memory 162) (see paragraph 19) for storing a telephone directory (contact information database 225) (see paragraph 30 and claim 15); a processor having access to the telephone directory stored in the memory (i.e., processor 160) (see paragraph 19); and a set of instructions capable of being executed by the processor for parsing Caller ID information, said Caller ID information

including at least a telephone number and an entity assigned the telephone number, and storing the parsed Caller ID information as a telephone directory listing within the telephone directory, wherein the processor creates the telephone directory listing using the caller ID information and stores the telephone directory listing within the memory (i.e., when a caller attempts to call a mobile device, caller ID validator receives and decodes the caller information of the phone call before mobile device answers, caller ID validator may provide the caller information to other software components of the mobile device, including contact information database) (see paragraphs 30, 32-33).

7. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pappalardo in view of Sagar.

Pappalardo discloses a telephone as described above (see claim 15 rejection).

Although Pappalardo discloses a telephone as described above, Pappalardo does not specifically disclose a telephone comprising performing the step of transferring at least the stored telephone directory listing to a remote central station.

However, Sagar discloses a telephone comprising performing the step of transferring at least the stored telephone directory listing to a remote central station (see fig. 1, col. 1, line 62-col. 2, line 4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings as described by Sagar with the teachings as described by Pappalardo to arrive at the claimed invention. A motivation for doing so would have been to share contact information among different devices.

8. Claim 17-20, 22-23, 26, 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Comp in view of Brown.

Regarding claims 17 and 23, Comp discloses a method and telephone directory management system (see abstract) comprising: a remote central station having a memory for storing a plurality of telephone directories each assigned an individual identification code and at least one processor (paragraph 11) having access to the plurality of telephone directories stored in the memory (i.e., the call log manager maintains a call log for individual users at a network storage location (see paragraph 19). And, each user is associated with an identification code (paragraph 25)); a plurality of cellular telephones each corresponding to a different subscriber and each storing a telephone directory (i.e., referring to fig. 3 where it is illustrated a plurality of cell phone users. And, Comp discloses that the call log maintained for each user by the call log manager include the same or similar information to that stored within a corresponding user device within the system (paragraph 19). Thus, each user device stores a telephone directory) and having a processor (inherent) for executing a set of instructions for establishing a communication link with the remote central station (i.e., placing a call to the server) (see paragraph 22); transferring at least a portion of the telephone directory stored to the remote central station (i.e., transfers of contact information to the server) (see paragraph 22).

Comp further discloses that the call log manager 52 is operative for maintaining a call log for individual users (paragraph 19). Comp also discloses in paragraphs 25-26 that user initiated transfers of information from the network to a user device may also or alternatively be supported. For example, a user may deliver an appropriate request to the call manager to transfer the user's

information to the new user device. This may also require a specific authorization or identification code) (also refer to paragraphs 9 and 16).

Comp, however, does not specifically disclose system and method comprising identifying at least a portion of a telephone directory of the plurality of telephone directories stored by the remote central station and corresponding to at least one of the plurality of cellular telephones and transferring at least the identified portion of the telephone directory to at least two of the plurality of cellular telephones, wherein the identified portion of the telephone directory includes at least one telephone directory listing created and transmitted to the remote central station using a computer device not corresponding to a subscriber of at least one of the at least two of the plurality of cellular telephones.

However, Brown discloses a system and method comprising identifying at least a portion of a telephone directory of the plurality of telephone directories stored by the remote central station and corresponding to at least one of the plurality of cellular telephones and transferring at least the identified portion of the telephone directory to at least two of the plurality of cellular telephones (i.e., in response to requests, user's contact information are transmitted to computer devices of the authorized users) (see paragraphs 9, 39-40), wherein the identified portion of the telephone directory includes at least one telephone directory listing created and transmitted to the remote central station using a computer device not corresponding to a subscriber of at least one of the at least two of the plurality of cellular telephones (i.e., Brown discloses a method and system for sharing contact information. The method and system comprising storing a user's contact information in a database accessible over a network, receiving identification of a person that the user wishes to authorize for access the user's contact information, enabling the person to

access the user's contact information, and transmitting the user's contact information to a computing device of the authorized person from the database via the network in response to a request for this information (see abstract, paragraphs 8-9, 33-36, and 42-43).

Thus, the combination of Sagar with Brown would yield to a system and method wherein a first device uploads a telephone directory to a server. This telephone directory can be shared by other users or subscribers that different from the user that uploaded the telephone directory. Those authorized users use identifiers or password to obtain the shared directory.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings as described by Comp with the teachings described by Brown to arrive at the claimed invention. A motivation for doing so would have been to properly and securely share the telephone directory with authorized users.

Regarding claim 18, Comp discloses a system (see claim 17 rejection) wherein the establishing and transferring steps are performed on a periodic basis (i.e., making transfer at periodic intervals) (see paragraph 14). Thus, one skilled in the art would find it obvious that connection to the server has to be done on a periodic basis since the transfer is done at periodic intervals.

Regarding claim 19, Comp discloses a system (see claim 17 rejection) wherein identifying and transferring steps are performed on a periodic basis (see paragraph 13 and claim 18 reasoning).

Regarding claim 20, the combination of Comp and Brown discloses a telephone wherein the processor executes the set of instructions for instructing the remote central station to broadcast the telephone directory to a plurality of cellular telephones (i.e., means for receiving an

identification of persons that a user authorizes to access the user's contact information, and means for transmitting the user's contact information to a computing device) (see Brown's paragraph 9).

Regarding claim 22, Comp discloses a system (see claim 17 rejection) wherein the processor executes the set of instructions for performing the steps of: identifying a calling party's telephone number and an entity the telephone number is assigned to, i.e., Caller ID information (i.e., the call log database may include call-related information for a predetermined number of previous calls that were placed from and/or received through the user device. The call log database will typically include the phone numbers of the other parties involved in the corresponding calls. Party names and/or other information (e.g., length of call, etc.) may also be stored. The controller may control the maintenance of the call log database or a separate control unit can be provided) (see Comp: paragraph 12); and transmitting the Caller ID information to the remote central station for creating a telephone directory listing using the caller ID information and storing the telephone directory listing within the memory of the remote central station (see Comp: fig. 2, abstract, and paragraphs 12 and 14).

Regarding claim 26, Comp discloses a method (see claim 23 rejection) further comprising the steps of: receiving Caller ID information, i.e., a calling party's telephone number and an entity the telephone number is assigned to; processing the received Caller ID information to create at least one telephone directory listing (i.e., the call log database may include call-related information for a predetermined number of previous calls that were placed from and/or received through the user device. The call log database will typically include the phone numbers of the other parties involved in the corresponding calls. Party names and/or other information

(e.g., length of call, etc.) may also be stored. The controller may control the maintenance of the call log database or a separate control unit can be provided) (see paragraphs 12 and 14); and storing the at least one telephone directory listing within the remote central station, wherein the at least one identified telephone directory includes the at least one telephone directory listing (paragraphs 12, 14, 19-20).

Regarding claim 28, Comp discloses a method (see claim 31 rejection), wherein the telephone directory listing includes information selected from the group consisting of name (see paragraph 13), home telephone number, mobile telephone number (Comp discloses that the address may typically include telephone numbers (it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to envision that telephone numbers may include home and mobile number) (see paragraph 13), home address, business address, e-mail address, and web-site address (it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art that home address, business address, e-mail address, and web-site address may be included as other contact information) (see paragraph 13).

Regarding claim 29, Comp discloses a method (see claim 23 rejection) further comprising the step of charging a fee to at least one subscriber of the plurality of cellular telephones (i.e., the call log manager only maintains call logs for users who subscribe to a call log service (e.g., for a small monthly fee)) (see page 3, paragraph 20).

Regarding claim 30, Comp discloses a method as described above (see claim 23 rejection).

Although Comp discloses a method wherein the user can request the transfer of contact information wherein the requested or selected contact information is sent, thereby obviously displayed on the device (see Comp: paragraph 26), Comp does not specifically disclose a method

wherein prior to the transferring step, displaying the at least one identified telephone directory via a display of at least one of the plurality of cellular telephones; and selecting at least a portion of the displayed telephone directory desired to be transmitted from the remote central station to the at least one the plurality of cellular telephones.

However, Brown discloses a method wherein prior to the transferring step, displaying the at least one identified telephone directory via a display of at least one of the plurality of cellular telephones; and selecting at least a portion of the displayed telephone directory desired to be transmitted from the remote central station to the at least one the plurality of cellular telephones (see figs. 6-7, and paragraphs 39-45).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings as described to arrive at the claimed invention. A motivation for doing so would have been to provide authorized users access to contact information stored at a remote location without the need to manually update or enter contact data.

9. Claims 21, 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Comp and Brown, further in view of Sagar.

Regarding claim 21, 24, and 25, the combination of Comp and Brown discloses a system as described above (see claim 17 rejection).

Although Brown discloses a system comprising transmitting a signal to the remote central station, said signal including at least an identification code identifying the telephone directory available for transmission (see abstract), the combination of Comp and Brown does not specifically disclose a system comprising receiving a message transmitted from the remote

central station indicating that the telephone directory is available for transmission from the remote central station to the cellular telephone for storage within the memory of the cellular telephone.

However, Sagar discloses a system comprising receiving a message transmitted from the remote central station indicating that the telephone directory is available for transmission from the remote central station to the cellular telephone for storage within the memory of the cellular telephone (see col. 4, lines 20-26). Thus, in combination with Comp and Wakabayashi, one skilled in the art would unhesitatingly conceptualize that the remote central station would send an indication to the users that are authorized to share the telephone directory of its availability.

Also, it worth noted that Sagar discloses a method wherein a user send a request for telephone directory information to the remote server (i.e., the mobile phone requests and receives the telephone directory from the server) (see fig. 1, col. 1, line 62- col. 2, line 4)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings as described by Sagar with the teachings described by Comp and Brown to arrive at the claimed invention. A motivation for doing so would have been to properly inform the user of directory information.

Conclusion

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PIERRE-LOUIS DESIR whose telephone number is (571)272-7799. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00AM- 5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dwayne Bost can be reached on (571)272-7023. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Pierre-Louis Desir/
Examiner, Art Unit 2617

/Dwayne D. Bost/
Supervisory Patent Examiner,
Art Unit 2617